



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE *AUTO DA BARCA DO INFERNO*¹ OF GIL VICENTE
AND THE SPANISH *TRAGICOMEDIA ALEGORICA*
*DEL PARAYSO Y DEL INFIERNO*²

Leandro Fernández de Moratín was perhaps the first to call attention to the relationship of the plays named in the title of this article. He described the Spanish play as an "imitation" of the Portuguese *Auto da Barca*. He did not intimate that he thought Vicente the author of the Spanish play; he called it "anonymous."³ Augustín Durán characterized the Spanish play as "a very free translation" of Vicente's *Auto*, and together with Moratín's annotator, Aribau,⁴ thought that Vicente himself wrote the translation.⁵ Menéndez y Pelayo⁶ is somewhat skeptical as to this, thinking that the language of the play is too nearly perfect for Vicente's Spanish. Other scholars take different views, while still others do not express an opinion.⁷

¹ The complete title of the play is: *Representa-se na obra seguinte hũa perfiguração sobre a rigorosa accusação, que os inimigos fazem a todas as almas humanas, no ponto que per morte de seus terrestres corpos se partem. E por tractar desta materia põe o Autor por figura que no dito momento ellas chegão a hum profundo braço de mar, onde estão dous batéis: hum delles passa pera a Gloria, outra pera o Purgatorio. He repartida em tres partes; s. de cada embarcação hũa scena. Esta primeira he da viagem do Inferno.*

Esta perfiguração se escreve neste primeiro livro nas obras de devação, porque a segunda e terceira parte forão representadas na capella; mas esta primeira foi representada de camara, pera consolação da muito catholica e sancta Rainha Dona Maria, estando enferma do mal de que falleceu, na era do Senhor de 1517. In Obras de Gil Vicente, correctas e emendadas pelo cuidado e diligencia de (J. V. Barreto Feio e J. G. Monteiro), I, 214-44. Lisboa, 1843.

² The full title is: *Tragicomedia allegorica del parayso y del infierno. Moral representacion del diuerso camino que hazen las animas en partiendo desta presente vida. Figurada por los dos nauios que aqui parescen: el vno del cielo y el otro del infierno. Cuya subtil inuencion y materia enel argumento dela obra se puede ver. In Cronan's Teatro español del siglo XVI, Tomo primero, 267-318, Madrid, 1913. Cronan uses two editions for his text, one of Burgos, 1539, now in the Biblioteca Nacional; the other, without place or date, at present in the Royal Library at Munich.*

³ *Orígenes*, No. 60. Written before 1828. In *Bib. Aut. Esp.*, II, Madrid, 1871.

⁴ See Note (no. 18) to the foregoing title.

⁵ Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, Madrid, 1899, No. 2501.

⁶ *Antología*, VII, clxxxviii.

⁷ Stiefel, *Archiv*, CXIX, 194, n. 2, thinks that perhaps the Spanish is an older version whose satire was softened in the Portuguese play. Klein, *Gesch. des Dramas*, IX, 130, and Schaeffer, *Span. Nationaldramas*, I, 28, say the play is anonymous. Creizenach, *Gesch. des neu. Dramas*, III, 129-30; Schack, Ticknor, *Amador de los Rios*; Lemcke, Carolina Michaelis, *Grundriss*, II, 2, 286; *Revista da Univ. de Coimbra*, I, and Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Hist. de la Lit. Esp.*, Madrid, 1914, pp. 180-82, do not express an opinion about the authorship of the *Tragicomedia*. Some of the older students of Spanish literature did not have access to the two plays, which accounts for their silence on the subject.

The purpose of this article is to study this question on the basis of a somewhat detailed comparison of the plays, first as to form, and secondly as to content.

The argument of both plays is briefly as follows. There are two boats on the stage. The captain of one is the devil and it goes to the *inferno*, the other is in the care of an angel and it goes to the *paraíso*. The characters enter one at a time, address the devil, learn where he wishes to carry them, and then they appeal to the angel, who refuses all save the *bobo* and the four knights who were killed while fighting the Moors. The characters are, of course, the souls of those who have died, and they are forced to take passage on one or the other boat. The action is nil, the interest being centered on the sarcastic comments of the angel and devil on the lives of those appearing before them, and the victims' defense of their conduct while on earth.

The dramatis personae of the two plays are the same and appear on the stage in the same order, with one exception. Below are given the characters in the order in which they appear. The references to the *Barca* are to the 1843 Lisbon edition; those to the *Tragicomedia* to Cronan's edition (see notes 1 and 2 on p. 173).

<i>Auto da Barca do Inferno</i>		<i>Tragicomedia</i>	
	Page		Line
Diabo.....	215	Diablo.....	198
Companheiro do diabo.....	215	Caron.....	Page 274
Fidalgo ¹	216	Hidalgo ¹	214
Anjo.....	217	Angel.....	298
Onzeneiro.....	221	Logrero.....	416
Parvo.....	223	Juan (called <i>parvo amigo</i> , 636) ..	569
Sapateiro.....	225	Frayle (<i>con vna moça</i>).....	658
Frade (<i>com hũa moça</i>).....	227	Çapatero.....	842
Brizida Vaz (<i>hũa alcoviteira</i>)....	231	Una Vieja (<i>alcahueta</i>).....	907
Judeu.....	234	Judio.....	1057
Corregedor.....	235	Corregidor.....	1135
Procurador.....	238	Abogado.....	1257
Enforcado.....	240	Ladron (<i>vn ahorcado</i>).....	1381
Quatro fidalgos.....	243	Quatro caualleros.....	1425

In the Spanish play Caron has no spoken rôle. The Portuguese *Companheiro do diabo* has three² one-line speeches on p. 215 and one

¹ The nobleman has a boy with him in each play, but in neither does the boy have a spoken rôle.

² L. 4 of the Portuguese play is a speech of the devil's companion. See Carolina Michaelis in *Revista Lusitana*, XV (1912), 273-74.

two-line speech on p. 231, and these only. Save the devil, his companion, and the angel, all the characters on entering the stage address the devil; this is true in both plays. In the *Barca do Inferno* the characters after addressing the devil speak to the angel, singly, with the following exceptions: Frade, p. 230, is answered by Parvo instead of by the angel; Judeu, p. 235, is answered by Parvo also; Corregedor and Procurador, pp. 239-40, go together to speak with the angel and on their return to the devil's boat, where they are to stay; the Corregedor speaks to Brigida, p. 240. Enforcado does not try to get passage in the boat of the angel. Parvo, after being assured his place in the *barca* of the angel, has speeches as follows: p. 230, two lines; p. 235, four lines; again p. 235, six lines; p. 239, two (Latin) lines.

In the Spanish play all the characters address the devil and then the angel, save the following: the Corregedor and Abogado, coming in separately, as in the Portuguese play, and talking a short time together with the devil, go to talk with the angel and Juan (ll. 1335-71). Ladron does not try to get into the angel's boat. Juan, after being assured his place in the boat of the angel (ll. 645-57), has the following lines: 823-26, 871-72, 895-98, 900-904, 1048-50, 1086-90, 1092, 1105-8, 1110, 1124-28, 1331-32, 1338-41, 1355-60 (mainly Latin), 1363-66, 1460.

The *Barca do Inferno* has no *introito* or *argumento* other than that given in note 1 (p. 173), while the Spanish play has a not unpleasant *introyto* and an *argumento* which relates briefly the action of the play. We learn (ll. 11-12) that he who recites the *introito* and *argumento* is a shepherd. The Portuguese play ends with the speech of the angel to the four knights (pp. 243-44), whereas the Spanish version, after the song of the four knights ends the main body of the piece, has a *deo gracias* and the following Latin: *In omnibus operibus tuis memorare nouissima tua: et in eternam non peccabis. Ecclesiastici septimo capit.* In addition there is an *aplicacion desta auctoridad al proposito delas dos barcas* in two eight-line stanzas, ending with a *Laus deo*.

The verse-form of the plays is the *pie quebrado*, that of the Spanish version being similar to that in Vicente's *Auto da Barca da Gloria* (*Obras*, I, 275-304).

The Portuguese play has 845 lines. The Spanish play, not including the *introito*, the *argumento*, or the *aplicacion*, has 1,275

lines (not including a missing line after l. 816); including the *introito* and *argumento* (and not including the incomplete stanzas after l. 196 and after l. 816) the Spanish play has 1,472 lines. That is a difference of 431 lines in the main body of the Spanish play as contrasted to the Portuguese version, and, including the *introito* and the *argumento*, a difference of 627 lines.

This of course is a very material increase in the length of the Spanish play. The question naturally arises, How is the increase distributed? Generally speaking, the increase is fairly evenly distributed throughout the play. There are very few instances where the passages in the Spanish version are shorter than the corresponding passages in the Portuguese play, and the reduction is slight. On the other hand, there is a larger number of instances where the corresponding passages are lengthened in the *Tragicomedia*.

As to the content, the reductions in the Spanish *rifacimento* are for dramatic reasons and, in the main, do not affect the ideas expressed. The expansions are for the purpose of giving greater opportunity for satire, which is directed primarily at the church and clergy. We shall now examine in some detail the corresponding passages of the two plays which have a difference worthy of note. We shall notice first those passages which are shorter in the Spanish version than in the *Barca*.

The opening scene of the Spanish play is 8 lines shorter than that of Vicente's play. This is due to the elimination of three speeches of the devil's companion, the reduction of the number of commands given to the companion, and finally to the omission of certain exclamations found in the Portuguese play.

The devil's second conversation with the nobleman is 12 lines shorter in the *Tragicomedia*, for the devil here cuts short the nobleman's plea to visit people on earth; the devil is more sarcastic in the Spanish scene.

In the scene of the shoemaker and the devil, the Spanish is 8 lines shorter on account of the elimination of direct charges of deception and robbery committed by the shoemaker, and the omission of a few lines showing the determination of both the devil and the shoemaker.

And finally, for dramatic reasons, the scene of the thief and the devil is 28 lines shorter, the ideas being substantially the same in both plays; the action in the Spanish play is briefer, more concise.

In noting the passages of the Portuguese play which have been expanded in the Spanish version, no attention is paid to some slight changes made in the order of the arrangement of the material when it was adapted by the author of the Spanish play. Save those noted above, nearly all the scenes of the Portuguese play have been lengthened more or less. Those that add anything other than a slight change in the order of presentation or a development of the dramatic possibilities follow.

The scene of the nobleman (*a*) with the devil is 42 lines longer in the Spanish play, owing mainly to the development of the theme of the nobleman's wife praying for him, and the devil's reproach for the life the nobleman lived in the world; (*b*) with the angel is 19 lines longer in the Spanish version, owing primarily to a more lengthy exposure of the nobleman's dissolute life and the useless religious ceremonies he performed to atone for his sins.

In the scene of the usurer and the devil the *Barca* hardly mentions the idea of the usurer's money securing him passage to heaven (see p. 221). It is to the development of this idea that the additional 20 lines in the *Tragicomedia* are largely due. Here the usurer says:

Quien viniera eneste dia descuydado,
sino tuuiera comprado
el cielo por mi dinero [424-27],

and adds that he bought a papal bull for two *reales* which will carry him to *gloria*. The devil tells him it is worthless, but he will try it on the angel. In the scene of the usurer and the angel in the *Barca* nothing is said of the bull though mention is made of the usurer's money. The angel sends him back to the devil immediately. This scene in the Portuguese play requires 14 lines. The Spanish play devotes 76 lines to the same scene. The usurer presents his bull as credentials and the angel refuses it, saying a *pecho sano* is to be preferred. The usurer replies:

Pues mira, no hablo en vano,
a mi ver:

no quereys obedescer
 lo que manda el santo Papa?
Angel: Al que los peccados papa
 no le absuelue su poder:
 si te quieres recoger
 en mi nauio,
 yo te ruego sin desuio,
 dime tu vida passada [ll. 466-75].

The usurer relates the story of his life, but the angel informs him that the two *reales* he spent availed him nothing as he did not benefit from the bull's spiritual graces.

The scene of the *bobo* in the *Tragicomedia* is 30 lines longer than the corresponding scene in the *Barca*. In the Spanish play the *bobo* enters singing a vulgar song of 6 lines that is not found in the Portuguese version. Nor do we find in the *Barca* the devil's reply to the *bobo*'s tirade which is in the Spanish play. In the Spanish version the *bobo* is much more spirited, more like the later *gracioso* than is his Portuguese counterpart. And in the Spanish play the *bobo* has many more speeches with the other souls than in the Portuguese play (see the lines given above).

The scene of the priest (*a*) with the devil is almost the same in both plays; (*b*) with the *bobo* 12 lines in the Portuguese version, and with the angel and *bobo* 70 lines in the Spanish play. In the *Barca* this scene has practically no dialogue or action. The scene in the *Tragicomedia* is devoted to a discussion between the angel and the priest of the priest's qualifications for passage on the angel's boat. The priest's desire to get his *dama* into heaven is emphasized in the Spanish play (ll. 760-62, 787-90), and although this point is brought out but once in the *Barca* (p. 230), the priest calls her by name three times within a space of 16 lines (pp. 230-31). The angel points out that the priest went into the priesthood to eat, drink, and enjoy other things not mentioned (see ll. 799-810). The priest replies that if these things were harmful to him he thinks no one can enter heaven. The angel answers:

Si, todos los deste cuento,
 los buenos trabajadores,
 sean grandes o menores,
 sea seglar o de conuento [ll. 819-22].

The scene of the hag and the devil is 33 lines longer in the Spanish than in the Portuguese version, owing to a more detailed account of her accomplishments; in the *Auto da Barca* her only statement in this regard is that on earth she had no equal (p. 232). In the scene with the angel in the Portuguese play the hag tells of her life. In the Spanish play this scene is taken up with the hag's plea with the angel. The hag of the *Tragicomedia* reminds one more of Celestina than the character in the *Barca*.

In the scene of the Jew and the angel of the Spanish play the appeal to the hatred of the Jewish race is stronger than in the Portuguese version. We are told that no Jew, living or dead, can enter heaven (ll. 1097-98); jokes are made at his expense by the *bobo* and he is reminded that he did not believe in Christ. In both plays the Jew offers money to get to heaven.

The additional material in the scene of the corregidor and procurador in the Spanish play is the corregidor's poor argument for passage to heaven; the devil's accusations against his graft and general maladministration, the guilty going free and the innocent being punished (see ll. 1191-1236); the satirical comments on the lawyer's methods (ll. 1279-1302), and the devil's ridicule of Salamanca (ll. 1309-12). In the Spanish play the character of the procurador is much better than in the *Auto da Barca*.

The Spanish play ends with a song which is a sort of *vale* to the audience, and which is a much better ending than that of the *Barca*. The religious *aplicacion* was added for the benefit of the inquisition.

Although there are frequent verbal similarities, literal translations of more than one or two lines are very rare in the Spanish play. The Spanish is almost always a free paraphrase where the ideas are identical. The following quotations give an idea of the language and the spirit of the two plays.

Auto da Barca do Inferno

Diabo: Á barca, á barca, hou lá,
Que temos gentil maré.
Ora venho a caro a ré:
Feito, feito, bem está.
Vae alli muitieramá,
E atesa aquelle palanco,
E despeja aquelle banco,

Tragicomedia

Diablo: Quien viniere embarcara,
que corre buena marea;
corre, compañero, arrea,
pon essa palanca alla;
essa plancha bien esta,
ponla en tierra;
mira si se desaferra,

Auto da Barca do Inferno

Pera a gente que virá.

Á barca, á barca, hu!

Asinha, que se quer ir.

Oh que tempo de partir!

Louvres a Berzebu.

Ora sus, que fazes tu?

Despeja todo esse leito.

Com.: Em bonora, logo he feito.

Dia.: Abaixa aramá esse cu.

Faze aquella poja lesta,

E alija aquella driça.

Com.: Ó caça, ó ciça.

Dia.: Oh que caravella esta!

Põe bandeiras, que he festa;

Verga alta, âncora a pique.

Ó precioso Dom Anrique!

Ca vindes vós? que cousa he esta?

Fidalgo: Esta barca onde vai ora,

Qu'assim está apercebida?

Dia.: Vai pera a Ilha perdida,

E ha de partir logo essora.

Fid.: Pera lá vai a senhora?

Dia.: Senhor, a vosso serviço.

Fid.: Parece-me isso cortiço.

Dia.: Porque vêdes lá de fóra.

Fid.: Porém a que terra passais?

Dia.: Pera o Inferno, senhor.

Fid.: Terra he bem sem sabor.

Dia.: Que! e também ca zombais?

Fid.: E passageiros achais

Pera tal habitação?

Dia.: Vejo-vos eu em feição

Pera ir ao nosso cais.

Fid.: Parece-te a ti assi.

Dia.: Em que esperais ter guarida?

Fid.: Que deixo na outra vida

Quem reze sempre por mi.

Dia.: Quem reze sempre por ti?

Hi hi hi hi hi hi hi.

E tu viveste a teu prazer,

Cuidando ca guarecer,

Porque rézão lá por ti?

Embarca, ou embarcae,

Qu' haveis d'ir á derradeira.

Mandae metter a cadeira,

Qu' assi passou vosso pae.

Fid.: Que, que, que! e assi lhe vai?

Tragicomedia

nunca te descuydes tu.

O gracioso Belzebu,

bien nos va en aquesta guerra!

passa aca, hi de vna perra;

a que esperas?

descoge aquessas vanderas,

el ancora ponla fuera;

cata a (don) Martin de Ribera,

con sus faldas muy rastreras.

Hidalgo: Di, barquero, a quien esperas,

por tu vida,

z la barca apercebida?

Dia.: Mi señor, a vos espera;

es ligera z gran velera;

z ya estamos de partida,

y va ala ysla perdida.

Hid.: Como assi?

no me embarcare yo ay.

Dia.: No sera esso en vuestra mano.

Hid.: Di burlas, barquero hermano;

como assi hablas a mi?

piensaste que avnque mori,

mi valor,

al fin, no es de vn gran señor?

Dia.: Si, guardenos Dios eterno;

vamos agora al infierno.

Hid.: Tierra es essa de dolor.

Dia.: Pues que tan grande fauor

vos teneys,

do quiera lo hallareys,

que alla no os faltara mando;

sus, diziendo y embarcando,

que mucho nos deteneys.

Hid.: No sera bien que lleueys,

assi perdida,

mi persona fauorida,

quanto mas que dexo alla

quien contino rezara

por mi mientras ouiere vida.

Dia.: O que seso sin medida

z sin saber!

por ventura es tu muger?

Hid.: Tu dizes verdad, por cierto.

Dia.: Avn tu no estauas bien muerto,

z daua saltos de plazer;

ayer la vide ofrecer,

con triste gesto,

Auto da Barca do Inferno

Dia.: Vai ou vem, embarcae prestes:

Segundo lá escolhestes,

Assi ca vos contentae.

Pois que ja a morte passastes,

Haveis de passar o rio.

Fid.: Não ha aqui outro navio?

Dia.: Não, senhor, qu' este fretastes,

E ja quando espirastes,

Me tinheis dado signal.

Fid.: Que signal foi esse tal?

Dia.: Do que vós vos contentastes

[pp. 215-17].

Tragicomedia

porque tu muriesses presto,

ofrendas z sacrificios;

ella esta agora a sus vicios,

en lugar no muy honesto;

sus, sus, sus, embarcad presto,

sin desuio,

pues fletastes el nauio.

Hid.: No hize tal auenencia.

Dia.: Qual tuuiste la conciencia,

assi fueste ageno, o mio;

quando con muy grande brio

passeauas,

quando las musicas dauas,

quando andauas muy pintado,

harto gordo y esmerado,

era señal que me dauas.

Hid.: Enessas cosas mirauas?

a, hombre tierno!

que para mi no ay infierno,

pues yo soy (muy) priuilegiado;

vn hildago tan honrrado

no va por esse gouierno.

Dia.: Mi fe, ya llego el inuierno;

digo, hermano,

siempre para vos verano

fue la vida sin desuio;

nunca vos sentistes frio,

ni dexo el guante la mano;

guay del misero aldeano

peccador,

que con su vida y sudor,

mantuuo vuestra mollejas!

vos pelandole las cejas,

procurando su dolor.

Hora sus, entrad, señor,

con vuestro rabo,

que me pareceys vn pauo;

quitaros [h]jan el pellejo,

pagareys el salmorejo,

que el escote viene al cabo.

Hid.: Parecesme malo y brauo

en tu dezir;

quica se querra partir

aquel barco que alli esta;

quierome llegar alla

[ll. 198-296].

From the foregoing one sees that the Spanish version is an adaptation of the Portuguese play. The general plan, the characters, and most of the ideas come from the *Barca*. In the *Barca* many of the thoughts are merely suggested, others are somewhat more developed, while in the *Tragicomedia* practically all the themes of the Portuguese play are expanded further, and some others are borrowed from other sources.¹

The verse-form of the Spanish play is not unlike that in one of Vicente's plays—the *Barca da Gloria*—and the *introito* and *argumento* could have been written by him.² The date of the *Tragicomedia* puts its composition within his period.³ But Vicente lived in Portugal and, so far as we know, never visited Castile. The titles of his Spanish plays—and his other plays for that matter—indicate that they were written for the court, often for the Spanish queens of the court. It is an important fact to keep in mind while considering Vicente as a possible author of the *Tragicomedia* that he wrote Spanish plays for a selected group at the court who understood Portuguese as well as Spanish. According to the title, the *Auto da Barca do Inferno* was written in Portuguese to be played before a very sick Spanish queen. Since Vicente wrote good Spanish, it is to be supposed that if the queen had had any difficulty in understanding Portuguese he would have written it in her native tongue. It is clear then that Vicente had no reason to transpose his play into Spanish for the audience for which he wrote. Furthermore, the *Tragicomedia* was not written for a Portuguese audience, but for an audience which understood only Spanish. In all Vicente's plays, Portuguese, Spanish, and Portuguese-Spanish, the titles of the pieces, the introductory notes, the generic names of the characters, and the

¹ The other sources will be treated in a subsequent article.

² Compare the *introito* and *argumento* of the *Auto pastoril Portuguez* (*Obras*, I, 127–31), where the *agora, agora, agora* (p. 127) reminds one of the *al fin, fin* of our play (ll. 18, 42). See the *Que, que, que, no se que, diga*, etc., in the *Tidea* of Francisco de las Natas (l. 72). In Cronan's *Teatro*, etc., see also *y en fin fin resumiran*, *Tidea*, 123. Compare the *introito* of the *Floresta de Enganos* (*Obras*, II, 138–43), written in 1536, whose tenor is not unlike that of the *Tragicomedia*.

It is worthy of note that this *introito* is one of the first to use the dialogue form, the interlocutors being a *philosopho* and a *parvo*; the latter is called a *bobo* (p. 138). The *introito* and prose *argumento* (pp. 142–43) are in Spanish; the play is in Portuguese.

³ The *Tragicomedia* was published at Burgos in 1539. The undated edition may be earlier, and, if not, it is quite possible that the play was written some time before it was printed. The earliest date given for the death of Vicente is 1536, the latest 1557.

The proper names of the characters have been made Spanish, and with the exception of the name of the *dama* with the priest and that of the hag the names have been *changed* in the Spanish play. The other proper names occurring in the play are Spanish. The five place-names are Spanish; three references are to Spanish cities, one is to Lisbon (ll. 61-62), and one is to Rome (l. 736). The Spanish cities named are Sevilla (l. 952), Salamanca (ll. 942, 1310), and Carmona. The reference to Carmona is really a reference to Sevilla. The speaker says that he lived in a *gran poblacion* which is *seys leguas de Carmona* (ll. 480-81). The references to Salamanca are to student life, not to the city as such. Sevilla is referred to as the home of the despised usurer and other disagreeable folk.

No emboceys, pues, los sentidos,
 7 veres
 vn hidalgo portugues, etc. [ll. 89–91],

The language of the play is purer Spanish than that of any other play attributed to Vicente. I have noted only one non-Spanish Portuguese word in the play, the word *boa* (l. 62), which was used because it rhymed with *Lisboa*.¹

679

It may be well to set down here Menéndez y Pelayo's impressions concerning the authorship of the play.

Pero esta *tragicomedia* castellana ¿es en realidad de Gil Vicente? Yo no acabo de persuadirme: la edición de Burgos, de la cual poseo copia fidelísima, no dice el nombre del autor. En otro manuscrito, copia sin duda de diversa edición, que cita Aribau en sus notas á los *Orígenes* de Moratín, parece que se leía la siguiente nota: "Compúsole en lengua portuguesa, y luego el mismo autor lo trasladó á la lengua castellana, aumentándolo." Si así fué, hay que reconocer que en esta ocasión se excedió notablemente á sí mismo como artífice de versos castellanos. Y esto es precisamente lo que me hace desconfiar de que él fuese el traductor. En sus coplas castellanas, Gil Vicente tiene cosas hermosísimas, pero está lleno de incorrecciones, de versos cojos, de rimas falsas, de vocablos enteramente portugueses, propios de quien nunca había estado en Castilla. Nada ó muy poco de esto hay en la *tragicomedia*, que es una de las piezas mejor escritas de aquel tiempo. [*Antología*, VII, CLXXXVIII.]

A careful study of Vicente's plays shows that although they are not *full* of the defects Menéndez y Pelayo attributes to them, they do have these defects in more or less degree.

The situation as regards the two plays may be summarized as follows: the Spanish play is not a mere translation of the *Barca*, but rather an adaption of it, introducing some ideas not found in Vicente's play. Although Vicente may have had the ability to write the *Tragicomedia*, his motive for producing such a *rifacimento* is by no means clear. The Spanish play has several qualities which differentiate it from Vicente's Spanish plays: the Spanish title, introductory notes, generic names of characters, and stage directions, and finally purer Castilian language. The probabilities are that the author of the *Tragicomedia* was not Vicente, but a Castilian who had carefully studied Vicente's thought and style and who succeeded admirably in reproducing them, at the same time incorporating in his work a few ideas taken from other sources.¹

W. S. HENDRIX

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

¹ I am indebted to Professor Karl Pietsch of the University of Chicago for assistance with the bibliography, and to Professor C. C. Marden of Johns Hopkins University for suggestions in the preparation of this article.